UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,654	10/02/2003	Michael J. Miller	027A.0001.U1(US)	4091

29683 7590 10/26/2006

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER	
CARLETON, THUY T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2196	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/678,654	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Carleton	2196	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/03/2005.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are pending in this application and have been examined.

Abstract

2. Applicant is reminded of the format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 15 lines and 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 12-14, 20-23, 26-29, 32, 36, 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US Patent 6,985,876).

As claim 1, Lee discloses a method to at least specify, document and prototype an instrument having specific user interface elements to meet individual customer/market needs

(abstract), comprising displaying, with a graphical user interface, an image of a customer-selected instrument type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29);

enabling the customer to specify, with the graphical user interface, individual ones of a plurality of instrument parameters in a self-documenting fashion (fig. 2B, label 30 and col. 7, lines 13-23);

in response to a selection of at least one type of instrument parameter, updating the displayed image to correspond to the selected instrument parameter (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 16-23);

and developing at least one prototype instrument for the customer based on the selected parameters and the self-documentation (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 7, lines 36-47; col. 7, lines 16-23).

As claim 5, Lee teaches a method to specify a gauge (abstract), comprising: in response to a user accessing a server coupled to the network (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43), displaying an image of a user-selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29); displaying in association with the selected gauge type a set of visual aids corresponding to configurable gauge functions (col. 7, lines 2-5);

specifying individual ones of the configurable gauge functions using said set of visual aids (col. 7, lines 2-7) and a drag and drop technique for selecting individual visual aids from the set of visual aids and associating a selected visual aid with a configurable gauge function (col. 7, lines 6-7);

and outputting a data file (col. 7, lines 24-31) for use in preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type in accordance with the gauge functions corresponding to the selected visual aids (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 12, Lee teaches a tool operable to enable a user to specify a gauge (abstract),

comprising a graphical user interface for displaying an image of a user-selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29), for displaying in association with the selected gauge type a set of visual aids corresponding to configurable gauge functions (col. 7, lines 2-5) and for enabling the user to specify individual ones of the configurable gauge functions using said set of visual aids (col. 7, lines 2-7) with a drag and drop technique for selecting individual visual aids from the set of visual aids and associating a selected visual aid with a configurable gauge function (col. 7, lines 6-7), said web tool being further operable for outputting a data file (col. 7, lines 24-31) for use in preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type in accordance with the gauge functions corresponding to the selected visual aids (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 20, Lee teaches a method to conduct business over a data communications network (abstract), comprising: in response to a user accessing a server coupled to the network (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43), displaying an image of a user-selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29);

displaying in association with the selected gauge type a set of visual aids corresponding to configurable gauge functions (col. 7, lines 2-5);

specifying individual ones of the configurable gauge functions using said set of visual aids (col. 7, lines 2-7) and a drag and drop technique for selecting individual visual aids from the set of visual aids and associating a selected visual aid with a configurable gauge function (col. 7, lines 6-7);

and outputting a data file (col. 7, lines 24-31) for use in preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type, in accordance with the gauge functions corresponding to the selected visual aids (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 22, Lee teaches a method to design at least one user interface element of an instrument (abstract), comprising: displaying an image of a selected instrument type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29);
specifying, through the use of a graphical user interface, at least one characteristic of the at least one user interface element (col. 7, lines 2-5);
in response to specifying the at least one characteristic, updating the displayed image to correspond to the specified at least one characteristic (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 16-23);
and developing an output data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) for use in obtaining at least one prototype sample of the instrument having the specified at least one characteristic of the at least one user interface element (fig. 4 and fig. 2B, labels 32 and 34; col. 7, lines 36-47).

As claim 43, Lee teaches an instrument comprising: a display for showing at least one user interface element (fig. 6, label 700; col. 9, lines 51-54);
a memory (fig. 6, label 710 and 730; col. 9, lines 21-22);
and an instrument controller that is coupled to said memory , to said display and to at least one instrument input (fig. 6, label 720 and 740; col. 9, lines 55-59), said memory storing data (fig. 6, label 730; col. 9, lines 26-30) for use by said instrument controller in mapping between said at least one instrument input and said at least one user interface element (col. 9, lines 60-64), where the data comprises data developed during an interactive design (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 13-15) process where there was displayed an image of a selected instrument type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29) for enabling a potential customer to specify, through the use of a graphical user interface (col. 7, lines 2-7), at least one characteristic of the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 2, Lee further teaches manufacturing an instrument based on the selected instrument parameters and the self-documentation (fig. 2A, label 22; col. 6, lines 10-13 and col. 7, lines 16-23).

As claim 6 and 13, Lee further teaches where the configurable gauge functions are located at fixed locations in the image (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 44-48).

As claim 7 and 14, Lee further teaches where the configurable gauge functions are located at user selected locations in the image (col. 6, lines 35-41).

As claim 21, Lee further teaches where the data communications network is comprised of the Internet (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43).

As claim 23, Lee further teaches where specifying comprises using a drag and drop technique (col. 7, lines 6-7).

As claim 26, Lee further teaches where at least a portion of the data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) is stored in the instrument (col. 9, lines 12-14) for use by a controller in controlling operation of the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 27, Lee further teaches where at least a portion of the data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) is stored in a non-volatile memory of the instrument (col. 4, lines 38-46) for use by an instrument controller in controlling operation of the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 28, Lee further teaches where at least a portion of the data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) is stored in a volatile memory of the instrument (col. 4, lines 38-46) for use by an instrument controller in controlling operation of the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 29, Lee further teaches where at least a portion of the data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) is stored in the instrument (col. 4, lines 38-46) for use by an instrument controller in mapping between at least one instrument input and the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 32, Lee further teaches where the instrument comprises a display (fig. 6, label 700; col. 9, lines 51-54), and where the data object is loaded into the instrument (col. 7, lines 24-31; col. 9, lines 12-14) for use by an instrument controller in displaying, in cooperation with the display, at least one specified user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 36, Lee further teaches where specifying comprises changing a location of a displayed user interface element (col. 6, lines 44-48).

As claim 39, Lee further teaches where the instrument comprises a gauge (col. 3, lines 49-54).

As claim 40, Lee further teaches where the display comprises a two dimensional array of separately addressable pixels (col. 9, lines 51-54).

As claim 41, Lee further teaches where the display comprises one of a liquid crystal display and a plasma display (col. 9, lines 51-54).

As claim 42, Lee further teaches where the instrument comprises a plurality of indicators and an overlay placed over the indicators, the overlay having areas selectively removed (col. 7, lines 2-5), and where the data object (col. 7, lines 24-31) is loaded into the instrument (col. 4, lines 38-46) for use by an instrument controller in displaying, in cooperation with the plurality of indicators and the overlay plurality of indicators and the overlay (col. 7, lines 2-5), the at least one specified user interface element (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-39).

As claim 44, Lee further teaches where the data developed during the interactive design process (col. 7, lines 24-31) is suitable for use in obtaining at least one prototype sample of the instrument having the specified at least one characteristic of the at least one user interface element (fig. 2B, labels 32 and 34; col. 7, lines 36-47).

As claim 45, Lee further teaches where the at least one user interface element comprises a gauge (col. 3, lines 49-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17-19, 24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Henson (US Patent 6,167,383).

As claim 3, Lee teaches method to specify a gauge (abstract), comprising: in response to a user accessing a server coupled to a data communications network (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43), displaying an image of a user-selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29); Lee does not teach specifying individual ones of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus. However, Henson teaches specifying individual ones of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus (fig. 3A, label 77; col. 9, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by specifying individual ones of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus as taught by Henson in order to provide the customer with pre-selected available options through an easier to use design interface;
and in response to a selection of at least one type of gauge function, changing the displayed image to correspond to the selected gauge function (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 16-23).

As claim 10, Lee teaches a tool operable to specify a gauge, comprising a graphical user interface for displaying an image of a selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29) and for enabling a user of the web tool (fig. 3; col. 6, lines 33-38). Lee does not teach to specify individual ones of gauge functions using at least one drop down menu. However, Henson teaches to specify individual ones of gauge functions using at least one drop down menu (fig. 3A, label 77; col. 9, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by teach to specify individual ones of gauge functions using at least one drop down menu as taught by Henson in order to provide the customer with pre-selected available options through an easier to use design interface, further operable, in response to a selection of at least one type of gauge

function, to change the displayed image to correspond to the selected gauge function (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 16-23).

As claim 17, Lee teaches a method to conduct business over a data communications network (abstract), comprising: in response to a user accessing a server coupled to the network (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43), displaying an image of a user-selected gauge type (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 2, lines 22-29);

Lee does not teach specifying individual ones of a plurality of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus. However, Henson teaches specifying individual ones of a plurality of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus (fig. 3A, label 77; col. 9, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by specifying individual ones of a plurality of gauge functions using a plurality of drop down menus as taught by Henson in order to provide the customer with pre-selected available options through an easier to use design interface;

and in response to a selection of at least one type of gauge function, changing the displayed image to correspond to the selected gauge function for providing the user with an image that corresponds to the selected gauge type having the selected gauge function (fig. 2B; col. 7, lines 16-23).

As claim 4, Lee further teaches preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type in accordance with the selected gauge functions (fig. 2B, label 34; col. 7, lines 36-41).

As claim 11, Lee further teaches operable to send a data file (col. 7, lines 24-31) for use in preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type in accordance with the selected gauge functions (fig. 2B, label 32; col. 7, lines 36-41).

As claim 18, Lee further teaches preparing at least one sample of the selected gauge type, in accordance with the selected gauge functions, for delivery to the user (fig. 2A, label 22; col. 6, lines 10-13).

As claim 19, Lee further teaches where the data communications network is comprised of the Internet (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 35-43).

As claim 24, Lee does not teach using a drop down menu technique. However, Henson teaches where specifying comprises using a drop down menu technique (fig. 3A, label 77; col. 9, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by where specifying comprises using a drop down menu technique as taught by Henson in order to provide the customer with pre-selected options through an easier to use design interface.

As claim 33. Lee does not teach performing a validity check to ensure that the at least one characteristic that is specified is compatible with the functionality of the at least one user interface element. However, Henson teaches performing a validity check to ensure that the at least one characteristic that is specified is compatible with the functionality of the at least one user interface element (col. 7, lines 57-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by performing a validity check to ensure that the at least one characteristic that is specified is compatible with the functionality of the at least one user interface element as taught by Henson in order to ensure all the user selected gauge components/options are compatible and will function properly before making the purchase order.

8. Claims 8-9, 15-16, 34 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Motomiya et al. (US Patent 6,083,267), hereafter "Motomiya"

As claim 8 and 15, Lee does not teach the configurable gauge functions are located at user selected locations in the image, and have a fixed size and shape. However, Motomiya teaches the configurable gauge functions are located at user selected locations in the image (col. 6, lines 7-10), and have a fixed size and shape (col. 4, lines 63-67 and col. 5, lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by locating the configurable gauge functions at user selected locations in the image as taught by Motomiya in order to ensure the gauge is designed utilizing the available fixed size and shapes to the users specifications.

As claim 9 and 16, Lee does not teach the configurable gauge functions are located at user selected locations in the image, and have at least one of a size and a shape selected by the user. However, Motomiya teaches the configurable gauge functions are located at user selected locations in the image (col. 6, lines 7-10), and have at least one of a size (col. 4, lines 63-67) and a shape (col. 6, lines 4-7) selected by the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by locating the configurable gauge functions at user selected locations in the image, and have at least one of a size and a shape selected by the user as taught by Motomiya in order to give the user the ability to design the gauge to their needs, by selecting the location, size and shape of the configurable gauge function.

As claim 34, Lee does not teach re-sizing a displayed user interface element. However,

Motomiya teaches re-sizing a displayed user interface element (col. 4, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by re-sizing a displayed user interface element as taught by Motomiya in order to give the user maximum flexibility of the display screens and make a more user friendly working environment.

As claim 38, Lee does not teach changing a shape of a displayed user interface element. However, Motomiya teaches changing a shape of a displayed user interface element (col. 6, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by changing a shape of a displayed user interface element as taught by Motomiya in order to give the user maximum flexibility of the display screens and make a more user friendly working environment.

As claim 37. Lee does not teach changing an aspect ratio of a displayed user interface element. However, Motomiya teaches changing an aspect ratio of a displayed user interface element (col. 4, lines 63-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by changing an aspect ratio of a displayed user interface element as taught by Motomiya in order to give the user maximum flexibility of the display screens and make a more user friendly working environment.

9. Claims 25 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kodosky et al. (US Pub 2004/0032433), hereafter "Kodosky"

As claim 25, Lee does not teach using a drawing tool. However, Kodosky teaches using a drawing tool (par [0012] and [0073]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by using a drawing tool as taught by Kodosky in order to give the ability to design the gauge or change the available gauge shape or size to meet the users specifications.

As claim 35, Lee does not teach changing an orientation of a displayed user interface element. However, Kodosky teaches changing an orientation of a displayed user interface element (par [0149] and [0152]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by changing an orientation of a displayed user interface element as taught by Kodosky in order to give the user maximum flexibility of the display screens and make a more user friendly working environment.

10. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kodosky, and further in view of Motomiya.

As claim 30, Lee does not teach using at least one tool. However, Kodosky teaches using at least one tool (par [0012] and [0073]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by using at least one tool as taught by Kodosky in order to provide the customer with an easy to use design interface. Lee and Kodosky do not teach enabling a user to select at least a placement, a size and a functionality of the at least one user interface element. However, Motomiya teaches enabling a user to select at least a placement (col. 6, lines 7-10), a size (col. 4, lines 63-67) and a functionality of the at least one user interface element (col. 6, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee and Kodosky by enabling a user to select at least a placement, a size and a

functionality of the at least one user interface element as taught by Motomiya in order to give the user the ability to design the gauge to their needs, by selecting the location, size and functionality of the configurable gauge function.

As claim 31, Lee does not teach using at least one tool comprising a drawing tool. However, Kodosky teaches using at least one tool comprising a drawing tool (par [0012] and [0073]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee by using at least one tool comprising a drawing tool as taught by Kodosky in order to give the ability to design the gauge or change the available gauge shape or size to meet the users specifications. Lee and Kodosky do not teach displaying a blank instrument face and enabling a user to select at least a placement, a size and a functionality of the at least one user interface element. However, Motomiya teaches displaying a blank instrument face (col. 4, lines 30-38) and enabling a user to select at least a placement (col. 6, lines 7-10), a size (col. 4, lines 63-67) and a functionality of the at least one user interface element (col. 6, lines 4-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee and Kodosky by displaying a blank instrument face and enabling a user to select at least a placement, a size and a functionality of the at least one user interface element as taught by Motomiya in order to provide the user the ability to design the gauge to their specification to meet their needs and to give the user the ability to design the gauge by selecting the location, size and functionality of the configurable gauge function.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Lee (US Pub 2005/0102199) – System and Method for enabling a user of an e-commerce system to visually view and/or configure a product for purchase.

Kodosky et al. (US Pub 2003/0184595) – Graphically deploying programs on devices in a system.

Mitchell et al. (US Patent 5,710,727) – System and method for creating resources in an instrumentation system.

Fuller et al. (US Patent 7,043,393) – System and method for online specification of measurement hardware.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Carleton whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TC

Thuy Carleton

N. El-Hady

NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER